

Remarks

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed August 19, 2009.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

In the Office Action dated August 19, 2009, Claims 1, 5, 7-8, 14, 18, 20 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Orbannes et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0109680, hereafter Orbannes). Claims 6, 17, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orbannes, in view of official notice. Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orbannes, in view of Takahashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,498 B2, hereafter Takahashi) and further in view of Rui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,349,005 B2, hereafter Rui).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendments

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 14, 17-21 and 23, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 5-9, 14 and 17-24. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action dated August 19, 2009, Claims 1, 5, 7-8, 14, 18, 20 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Orbannes (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0109680).

Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. *(Currently Amended) A method for managing audio devices located at a live event during the live event, comprising:*

capturing video content of the live event at a first location, wherein different areas of the video content, corresponding to different areas of the live event, are associated with a plurality of the audio devices located at the first location, the audio devices capturing audio originating from the different areas in the live event;

providing the video content of the live event captured at the first location to a user at a second location during the live event wherein the video content is displayed to the user in a graphical user interface (GUI) that enables the user to select regions of the displayed video content to receive audio from different audio devices at the live event associated with

the selected regions;

receiving a selection of a first region of the video content, the selection made

by the user during the live event, and

within the video content shown in the GUI;

determining which audio devices at the first location are associated with the first region;

selecting a first audio device at the first location associated with the first region; and

providing live audio from the selected first audio device at the first location to the user at the second location.

Orbanes discloses a method and apparatus for viewing information. In one embodiment, the system of the invention enables the user to view displayed information in a way that is comparable to a selected physical paradigm. Example physical paradigms include, but are not limited to, financial, educational, governmental, sports, media, retail, travel, geographic, real estate, medical, physiological, mechanical, surveillance, agricultural, industrial, infrastructure, scientific and other like paradigms. (Abstract). FIG. 1 is a schematic diagram depicting an exemplary embodiment of a viewing a system 100 in accord with the invention. The viewing system 100 includes an extractor module 102, a stylizer module 104, a template 105, a protocolizer 106, user controls 107, and a display 108, which present data objects to the user in a virtual three dimensional space 110. (Paragraph [0051]; Figure 1). In the virtual space 110, the adjustable user viewing perspective is represented by the position of a camera 116. The user manipulates the controls 107 to change the viewing perspective, and thus the position of the camera 116. Through such manipulations, the user can travel throughout the virtual space 110, and view, search through, and interact with, the data objects 114a-114g. (Paragraph [0052]).

Applicant respectfully submits that Orbanes appears to disclose navigating a three-dimensional virtual space that includes hierarchically arranged data objects. The virtual space appears to represent the data objects within a physical paradigm and allows a user to navigate around those data objects. As the user navigates closer to a representation of one of the data objects, the user appears to be provided with additional information about that object. For example, if the data object is a sound file, the closer the user navigates to that data object, the louder sounds associated with that file are played.

As described above, in Orbanes, navigation operations, including zooming in/out and changing perspective, appear to occur within a virtual space. However, when the user makes a selection, it appears to be within the virtual space, and not within any particular data object represented therein. For example, when a user “zooms in,” the user does not appear to be

interacting with the data object itself, but rather with the virtual space in which the data object is represented.

However, Claim 1, as amended, recites receiving a selection of a first region of the video content, the selection made by the user during the live event, and within the video content shown in the GUI. Thus, in the embodiment of Claim 1, a selection is made within the video content itself. Applicant respectfully submits that Orbannes does not appear to disclose or render obvious this feature.

Claim 1, as amended, further recites determining which audio devices at the first location are associated with the first region. Although Orbannes appears to disclose that audio may be associated with data objects, Applicant respectfully submits that Orbannes does not appear to disclose determining which audio devices at the first location are associated with the first region, as recited by Claim 1.

Instead, in Orbannes, the user appears to be navigating a virtual space that is represented as a map. As the user “zooms in” near a data object representing a street, “typical street noises” may be played; if the user then navigates near a data object representing a restaurant, “typical restaurant sounds” may be played instead. Applicant respectfully submits that while these sounds appear to be associated with their respective data objects, Orbannes does not appear to disclose or suggest that they are live; nor does Orbannes appear to disclose any remote audio devices that are providing these sounds. Applicant further respectfully submits that Orbannes does not appear to disclose determining which audio devices at those locations are associated with the data object.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 and 23

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 14 and 23 have been similarly amended to more clearly recite the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 14 and 23 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 7-8, 18, 20 and 22

Claims 5, 7-8, 18, 20 and 22 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1 or 14. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 5, 7-8, 18, 20 and 22 are allowable as depending upon

an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. However, to assist the Examiner in examining these claims, Applicant has provided comments below on several of these claims.

Claims 5 recites selecting a plurality of audio devices at the first location associated with the first region; comparing parameters for each audio device; and selecting one of the plurality of audio devices. As described above, Orbannes does not appear to disclose remote audio devices. Applicant respectfully submits that Orbannes further does not disclose comparing parameters for each audio device; and selecting one of the plurality of audio devices.

Claims 7 and 18 recite determining that no audio device is associated with the first region; and determining an alternative audio device to operate as the audio device associated with the first region, the alternative audio device configured to capture audio associated with the first region. In Orbannes, when audio is presented to the user, it appears to be associated with a particular data object. Applicant respectfully submits that Orbannes does not appear to disclose an alternative audio device, as recited by Claim 18.

Claims 8, 20 and 22 have not been addressed separately herein; however, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action dated August 19, 2009, Claims 6, 17, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orbannes, in view of official notice. Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orbannes, in view of Takahashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,498 B2) and further in view of Rui (U.S. Patent No. 7,349,005 B2).

Claims 6, 9, 17, 19, 21 and 24 are not addressed separately herein; however Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Request for Interview

In the event the above remarks fail to place the case in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the opportunity to interview with the Examiner at his convenience, and prior to the issuance of a subsequent Office Action, to assist in expediting prosecution. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 11, 2010

By: /Nathan L. Feld/
Nathan L. Feld
Reg. No. 59,725

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800